

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the concepts of the present invention. More particularly, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate subject matter from independent claim 3 therein.

It is submitted that these amendments to claim 1 are helpful in distinguishing the subject claims over the cited prior art and do not raise new issues which would require further consideration and/or search. In addition, it is submitted that such amendments place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. Furthermore, no additional claims are presented without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. In view of the above, it is submitted that entry of the above amendments is in order and such is respectfully requested.

In the Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the publication to Steckl et al published in IEEE Transactions in view of the patent to Steckl et al. In making this rejection, it basically was asserted that the publication teaches the entire manufacturing apparatus as set forth in the noted claims except for teaching that the substrate is a SOI substrate of the recited characteristics. The patent to Steckl et al was then asserted to provide this teaching deficiency in terms of a SOI substrate. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above claim amendments and the following

comments is respectfully requested.

It is submitted that the manufacturing apparatus of a buried insulating layer-type semiconductor silicon carbide substrate as defined by independent claim 1 as amended herein is not taught or suggested by the cited publication to Steckl et al and the patent to Steckl et al, whether taken singly or in combination. Among other things, these publications do not teach or suggest a manufacturing apparatus of a buried insulating layer-type semiconductor silicon carbide substrate as defined by independent claim 1 which has structure so as to be able to perform the First through Third steps as disclosed in the subject application.

According to the subject Action, independent claim 3 was allowed on the basis that the apparatus has structure to perform the "Third step." Consequently, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite these particular steps in terms of structure for the apparatus which enables the steps to be performed. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable for the same reasons claim 3 was found to be allowable.

For the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claim 1 as amended over the cited publications are respectfully requested.

Serial Number: 10/802,806
OA dated 2/21/05
Amdt. dated 6/14/06

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that claims 3-6 are allowed.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the subject application is now in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, the undersigned hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2340, along with any other additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



Donald W. Hanson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27,133

Atty. Docket No. 021740A
Suite 1000, 1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930
DWH/nk



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE